

From: [Jay Field](#)
To: [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)
Cc: [Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [rgensemer@parametrix.com](#); [Robert Neely](#)
Subject: Re: Bioassay Interpretation at Portland Harbor
Date: 06/08/2009 12:34 PM

Eric,
please ignore the following statement in my previous email: "one sample with maximum tox level classification of 2 is affected (ie, samples that classify as level 2 for the endpoint but are not statistically significant and no other endpoint would classify >= 2). " there are more than one of those samples (all classified by either chl0s or chl0b) If you like I will provide a list of the stations affected and the tox results.
Jay

Jay Field wrote:

> Eric,
> attached is a file including control-adjusted values, significance,
> and tox level classification for the samples. As I mentioned
> previously, I did not take statistical significance into account. one
> sample with maximum tox level classification of 2 is affected (ie,
> samples that classify as level 2 for the endpoint but are not
> statistically significant and no other endpoint would classify >= 2).
> there are a number of such samples for tox level = 1. If those
> samples are an issue, we should ask LWG for a determination of
> statistical power (for Round 2, LWG classified samples as not
> significant, significant, or indeterminate).
> Jay

>
>
>
> Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov wrote:
>> I agree. The message I left with John this morning was to figure out
>> what information we should exchange (us to them, them to us) to
>> facilitate this discussion. Can you could start to pull together a
>> similar package for the LWG?

>> Thanks, Eric

>>
>>
>> Jay
>> Field
>> <Jay.Field@noaa.gov>

>> To Eric
>> Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA 06/08/2009
>> 11:03 cc
>> AM Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
>> rgensemer@parametrix.com,

>> Joe
>> Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Chip

>> Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA

>> Subject Re: Bioassay
>> Interpretation at Portland
>> Harbor

>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> Eric,
>> before we talk with John, I think we should request a table from LWG
>> with raw values, control-adjusted values, significance, and tox level
>> classification. Without knowing what the discrepancies are, I'm not
>> sure what we would accomplish by having a discussion. Also, I would
>> like some more clarification on item #3, calculation of hit level. We
>> used the reference envelope value (REV) and 90%, 80%, and 70% of that
>> value to determine the thresholds. (all values are control-adjusted
>> values). this is the same as subtracting 10% of the REV from the REV,
>> but avoids potential compounding rounding errors.

>> I'm available most of this week except Thursday.

>> Jay

>> Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov wrote:

>> At the AOPC meeting, it became apparent that our interpretation of
>> the sediment bioassay results did not match the LWG's
>> interpretation. I am interested in understanding the basis for
>> this discrepancy. Based on my review of the data, the bioassay
>> results match up with the bins that we established in Table RE-2
>> in our March 31, 2009 direction to LWG (see previous email). Last
>> week, I put in a call to John Toll to try to understand the LWG's
>> interpretation. Although I did not speak directly with John, he
>> left me a voice mail that described 3 possibilities for the
>> discrepancy:

>>
>> 1) The raw response rates differ slightly - e.g., 15% vs. 17%.
>> John does not know why this is the case.
>> 2) Significance Testing. The LWG used the biostats software. He
>> indicated that this is a complicated procedure but that the LWG
>> followed the decision tree associated with the software package
>> and did not make any choices that were inconsistent with the
>> decision tree.
>> 3) The calculation of the level of the hit (e.g., low, moderate
>> or severe toxicity) based on a comparison to the reference
>> envelope was based on an added 10% to the reference envelop
>> opposed to multiplying by the reference envelope value by 1.1 or
>> 1.2.

>>
>> I would like to set up a time to discuss this sometime this week.
>> Please let me know when you might be available. I will work with
>> John to hopefully have some information that we can use to focus
>> the discussion.

>>
>> Thanks, Eric,
>>
>>

>> --
>> Jay Field
>> Assessment and Restoration Division
>> Office of Response and Restoration, NOAA
>> 7600 Sand Point Way NE
>> Seattle, WA 98115-6349
>> (P) 206-526-6404
>> (F) 206-526-6865
>> (E) jay.field@noaa.gov
>>
>>
>>
>

--
Jay Field
Assessment and Restoration Division
Office of Response and Restoration, NOAA
7600 Sand Point Way NE
Seattle, WA 98115-6349
(P) 206-526-6404
(F) 206-526-6865
(E) jay.field@noaa.gov